

09/764,254

**REMARKS**

Claims 2 through 7 and 9 through 11 are pending in this Application. Claim 2 has been amended to address a typographical oversight and for clarity. Applicants submit that the present Amendment does not generate any new matter issue.

This Amendment supplements the Amendment submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.14 together with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) on December 2, 2003. On March 12, 2004, the Examiner issued an Advisory Action indicating that the Amendment submitted December 2, 2003 would not be entered asserting it raised a new matter issue. On March 22, 2004, a telephone interview conducted with Examiner Prasad, during which he was advised that an RCE was filed and, hence, the issuance of an Advisory Action was improper. Examiner Prasad indicated he had no record of receiving the RCE. A copy of the RCE amendment and petition for extension of time was then faxed to Examiner Prasad together with a readout from TAPS PAIR indicating that the USPTO had received the RCE. During a subsequent telephone communication, Examiner Prasad agreed that the RCE was received in the USPTO, and suggested filing a supplemental response.

Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for immediate allowance, for reasons expressed in the Amendment submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.14 on December 2, 2003. Applicants would further submit that the present amendment does not generate any new matter issue. Adequate descriptive support for the recited ratio of the optical power propagating through said jacket region to the total optical power propagating through said optical fiber as no more than  $10^{-6}$  should be apparent from page 18 in the written description of the specification, lines 11 through

09/764,254

13. Applicants would stress that *ipsis verbis* support in specification for claim language is not required. *Wang Laboratories, Inc. v. Toshiba Corp.* 993 F2d 858, USPQ2d 117 (CAFC 1993). Rather, the written description requirement of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 is satisfied if the concept encompassed by a claim was originally disclosed. *In re Anderson*, 411 F2d 1237, 176 USPQ 331 (CCPA 1973). It has been repeatedly held that the written description requirement does not require an applicant to describe precisely the subject matter claimed. Rather the disclosure should be sufficient to allow one having ordinary skill in the art to recognize that applicants invented what is now claimed. *Union Oil Co. of California v. Atlantic Richfield Co.* 208 F3d 989, 54 USPQ2d (Fed. Cir. 2000) 1227.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants submit that neither the Amendment submitted on December 2, 2003 pursuant to 35 C.F.R. § 1.114, nor the present Amendment generates any new matter issue. Applicants again submit that for the reasons expressed in the Amendment submitted on December 2, 2003, all pending claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Favorable consideration is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

09/764,254

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT, WILL &amp; EMERY

  
Arthur J. Steiner  
Registration No. 26,106

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
(202) 756-8000 AJS:blh:ntb  
Facsimile: (202) 756-8087  
Date: March 31, 2004

WDC99 896982-1.050212.0186

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION  
I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOLLOWING PAPER IS BEING  
FACSIMILE TRANSMITTED TO THE UNITED STATES  
TRADEMARK OFFICE ON THE DATE SHOWN BELOW.

Arthur J. Steiner  
TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PERSON  
Arthur J. Steiner  
SIGNATURE

3-31-04  
SIGNING CERTIFICATION  
3-31-04  
DATE